



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/633.139 08/04/00 NAKAZAWA

T 000977

023850 MMC1/0829
ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW, SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON DC 20006

EXAMINER

LAM, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED:

08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,139

Applicant(s)

Ojima et al.

Examiner

Thanh Lam

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Jul 6, 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior art (fig. 1-2 of the application) in view of kliman.

Prior art (fig. 1 and 2) disclose all the aspect of the claimed invention except for the use of a reluctance motor having magnetic salient poles and a permanent magnet disposed respectively in the salient

Kliman discloses a reluctance motor having magnetic salient poles and a permanent magnet disposed respectively in the salient poles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the motor structure as taught by prior art and replace the reluctance rotor of

Art Unit: 2834

Kliman as disclosed above to take place of the rotor of prior art that provides a reluctance rotor with increasing the rotor speed and strength.

4. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art in view of Kliman. As applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Trago et al.

Prior art and Kliman disclose essentially claimed invention except for the shield member comprising a mold body of a synthetic resin and the stator being embedded in the resin.

Trago et al. disclose a mold body of a synthetic resin and the stator being embedded in the resin for improving corrosion resistance of the stator.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the shield member of prior art and replace the mold resin as taught by Trago et al. for preventing corrosive and improving the corrosion resistance of the stator.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art in view of Kliman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Naito et al.

Prior art and Kliman. disclose all the aspect of the claimed invention except for the rotor is made of permalloy.

Naito et al. disclose permalloy material (col. 14, line 4-5) for making a rotor in order to prevent corrosion of the rotor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the rotor as taught by Prior art and apply the use of permalloy as disclosed by Naito et al. into the rotor that would provide the rotor with a high corrosion resistance.

Art Unit: 2834

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Lam whose telephone number is (703) 308-7626. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0656.



Thanh Lam

Aug. 22, 2001



NESTOR RAMIREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800